UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/605,855	06/29/2000	Robert James Lockwood	95-424	7975

23164   7590   10/08/2002

LEON R TURKEVICH
2000 M STREET NW
7TH FLOOR
WASHINGTON, DC 200363307

EXAMINER
KIDD, MARKY M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2645	

DATE MAILED: 10/08/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/605,855	LOCKWOOD, ROBERT JAMES
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Marky M Kidd	2645

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *29 June 2000*

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☐ Claim(s) *1-30* is/are pending in the application.

　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) *1-30* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) *2, 5, 8,13, 17, 22, and 28* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

　If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

　　1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

　a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1.   **Claims 2, 13, 17 and 28** are objected to because of the following informalities:

inconsistent in abbreviation of SMTP or SMPP protocol. Claim 2 (line 2) and 17 (line 2) the

protocol is referred to SMPP, but in claim 13 (line 2) and 28 (line 2) it is referred to as SMTP. In

the specification and drawings the protocol is referred to as SMPP (page 1, line 9; page 4, line

10; page 5, line 5; and figure 1). It is the examiner's understanding that SMPP is the correct

abbreviation. Please clarify the correct abbreviation and name of the protocol. Appropriate

correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

3.   **Claim 1, 8-11, 12, 15, 27-30** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Pepe et al (US Patent 5, 742, 905) in view of Deneberg et al (US 2002/0076009 A1).

Regarding **claim 1**, Pepe discloses a notification system (PCI Server 48) that consist of a

method for a messaging server (PDA 30) to identify the user (caller) based on the destination

telephone number in the first format consisting of the destination telephone number in a second

format and outputting the message having the destination telephone number having the first

format (column 30, lines 34-44). Pepe is silent on the issue of converting the destination

telephone number in the second format to the destination telephone number in the first format

based on execution of a mapping rule selected based on a match between the mapping rule and at

least a portion of the destination telephone number in the second format. Denenberg; however,

teaches that recognizing country names in conjunction with the telephone numbers (country

codes) will allow calls to be converted based off the destination telephone number received from

the caller (column 2, paragraph 0010). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the

time of the invention to using the converting rules as taught by Denenberg in the messaging

server of Pepe for the purpose of converting the destination telephone number in the second

format to the destination of the telephone number in the first format based. This conversion is

needed to ensure that the notification system (PCI Server 48) does all the conversion needed in

order for the message server (PDA 30) to recognize the destination telephone number.

Regarding **claims 8 and 9**, Deneberg discloses a converting step that matches the

mapping rule, a portion of the destination telephone number in the second format based on a

pattern within the destination telephone number in the second format, and determines that the

prescribed pattern of the regular pattern is specified within the matched mapping rule (page 2,

paragraphs 0026 and 0028).

Regarding **claim 10**, Deneberg discloses a method in the converting step consisting of

replacing at least a portion of the destination telephone number in the second format with a

replacement value specified in the matched mapping rule (page 2, paragraph 0028).

Regarding **claim 11**, Denenberg discloses the method of the first format is an

international telephone format, and the second format in a national telephone format (page 2,

paragraph 0017).

Regarding **claims 12 and 27**, Pepe discloses a notification system that sends a notification message for a user to a message interface (PCI server 48) configured for receiving the notification message and having a destination telephone number in the second format, and a output interface (protocol handler 115) configured for outputting to the message server (PCI server 48) the notification message in the first format of the destination telephone number (column 8 lines 65-67 and column 9, lines 1-5). Pepe is silent on the issue of a dial map that converts the destination telephone number in the second format to the destination telephone number in the first format, where the dial map executes a selected mapping rule based on a match between the mapping rule and at least a portion of the destination telephone number in the second format. Denenberg; however, teaches a system that will map a name and location with a telephone number supplied by a caller once a match is made (column 2, paragraph 0010 and paragraph 0028). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to using the mapping rules as taught by Denenberg in the notification system of Pepe for the purpose of converting the destination telephone number in the second format to the destination of the telephone number in the first format based. Allowing the output interface to output the notification message to the message server for identification of the user based on the destination telephone number in the first format without having to convert the telephone number.

Regarding **claim 29**, Deneberg discloses a converting means for storing a plurality of mapping rules specifying a corresponding first expression, the corresponding second expression having the first format, and the dial map selecting the mapping rules are matched based on a match between the destination telephone number having the second format and the corresponding first expression (page 2, paragraph 0026, 0027, and 0028).

Regarding **claim 30**, Deneberg discloses a converting means that selects the mapping rule based on the corresponding first expression specifying a regular expression having a specified pattern that matches at least a portion of the destination telephone number having the second format (page 2, paragraph 0033).

Regarding **claims 14 and 15**, Deneberg discloses a system that uses a mapping rule specifying a corresponding first expression, and matching the destination telephone number in a second format to the corresponding first expression. The mapping rule also specifies a regular expression having a specified pattern that matches at least a portion of the destination telephone number having the second format (page 2, paragraph 0033 and 0034).

Regarding **claims 13 and 28**, Pepe discloses an output interface (protocol handler 115) that consists of outputting the notification message to the message server (PCI server 48) in the first format. Deneberg discloses a mapping technique for converting the destination telephone number in the first format to a second format. Both Pepe and Denenberg are silent on the issue of using the output interface to output the notification message according to Short Message Peer to Peer (SMTP) protocol. Lorello discloses a message server (SMSC 120) that includes an interface (communication interfaces 121 and 122), which handles receipt and delivery of messages to and from the network (column 9, lines 8-14). The notification messages (SMSNOT) delivered through the network are done by Short Message Peer to Peer protocol (column 10, lines 53-58). Pepe discloses the system consisting of an output interface (protocol handler 115) for outputting notification messages to the message server (PCI server 48). Denenberg discloses a system consist of mapping of converted telephone numbers. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use the output interface of Pepe, as modified by outputting the converted

telephone number of Denenberg, and further modifying by delivering of the notification message according to Short Message Peer to Peer protocol as taught by Lorello.

4.   **Claims 2-7** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pepe in view of Denenberg in further view of Lorello (US Pat 6,208,870).

Regarding **claim 2,** Pepe discloses a method for a messaging server (PCA 30) to identify the user (caller) based on the destination telephone number in the first format consisting of the destination telephone number in a second format and outputting the message having the destination telephone number having the first format (column 30, lines 34-44). Denenberg teaches that recognizing country names in conjunction with the telephone numbers (country codes) will allow calls to be converted based off the destination telephone number received from the caller (column 2, paragraph 0010). Pepe and Deneberg, however, are both silent on the issue of outputting the notification message to the messaging server according to Short Message Peer to Peer (SMPP) protocol. Lorello discloses that notification messages (SMSNOT) are output from one message server (SMSC) to another using the SMPP protocol (column 10, lines 53-58). Pepe discloses the method of outputting a notification message in the first format. Denenberg discloses the method of converting the telephone number of the notification message from the second format to the first format. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to use the SMPP protocol as the output protocol for connection to the messaging server of Pepe for output of the converted telephone number of the notification message of Denenberg.

Regarding **claim 3,** Lorello discloses a message server (SMSC) that consist of sending

notification messages to a wireless telephone in the form of the destination telephone number in

the first format (column 1, lines 58-61).

Regarding **claim 4,** Denenberg discloses the method of the first format is an international

telephone format, and the second format in a national telephone format (page 2, paragraph 0017).

Regarding **claims 5 and 6,** Deneberg discloses a converting step that matches the

mapping rule, a portion of the destination telephone number in the second format based on a

pattern within the destination telephone number in the second format, and determines that the

prescribed pattern of the regular pattern is specified within the matched mapping rule (page 2,

paragraphs 0026 and 0028).

Regarding **claim 7,** Deneberg discloses a method in the converting step consisting of

replacing at least a portion of the destination telephone number in the second format with a

replacement value specified in the matched mapping rule (page 2, paragraph 0028).

5.   **Claims 16, 23, 24, 25, and 26** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Gustafsson (US Patent 6,424,841 B1) in view of Denenberg.

Regarding **claim 16,** Gustafsson discloses a computer readable medium consisting of

instructions for sending a notification message to a message server (Short Message Service

Center) where the instructions include steps for obtaining a notification message of a destination

telephone number in a second format, and outputting the notification message having the

destination telephone number in the first format (column 3, lines 25-27).   Gustafsson is silent

on the issue of converting the destination number in the second format to the destination number

of the first format based on mapping rules. Deneberg discloses a method of converting the

destination telephone number in the second format to the first format by means of mapping the telephone number based on the information provided by the caller (page 2, paragraph 0010). Gustafsson discloses the medium of obtaining and outputting the notification message through instructions. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use the instructions for performing steps of obtaining the notification message in the second format, convert the second format to the first format; therefore, outputting the message in the first format.

Regarding **claims 23 and 24** Deneberg discloses a converting step that matches the mapping rule, a portion of the destination telephone number in the second format based on a pattern within the destination telephone number in the second format, and determines that the prescribed pattern of the regular pattern is specified within the matched mapping rule (page 2, paragraphs 0026 and 0028).

Regarding **claim 25**, Deneberg discloses a medium consisting of the converting step of replacing at least a portion of the destination telephone number in the second format with a replacement value specified in the matched mapping rule (page 2, paragraph 0027 and 0028).

Regarding **claim 26**, Denenberg discloses the method of the first format is an international telephone format, and the second format in a national telephone format (page 2, paragraph 0017).

6.   **Claims 17-22** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gustafsson in view of Denenberg further in view of Lorello.

Regarding **claim 17**, Gustafsson discloses a computer readable medium consisting of instructions for sending a notification message to a message server (Short Message Service Center) where the instructions include steps for obtaining a notification message of a destination

telephone number in a second format, and outputting the notification message having the destination telephone number in the first format (column 3, lines 25-27). Deneberg discloses a method of converting the destination telephone number in the second format to the first format by means of mapping the telephone number based on the information provided by the caller (page 2, paragraph 0010). However, Gustafsson and Deneberg are silent on the issue of the output step outputs the notification message to the messaging server according to Short Message Peer to Peer (SMPP) protocol. . Lorello discloses a notification messages (SMSNOT) delivered through the network is done by Short Message Peer to Peer protocol (column 10, lines 53-58). Gustafsson discloses the system consisting computer readable medium that consists of instructions for obtaining the notification message in the first format, but outputting the notification message in the second format. Denenberg discloses a system consisting of a mapping rule for converted telephone numbers. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use the output interface of Pepe, as modified by outputting the converted telephone number of Denenberg, and further modifying by delivering of the notification message according to Short Message Peer to Peer protocol as taught by Lorello. This modification would ensure that the message server would receive the notification message in a protocol, which it can recognize.

7.   Regarding **claim 18,** Lorello discloses a message server (SMSC) that consist of sending notification messages to a wireless telephone in the form of the destination telephone number in the first format (column 1, lines 58-61).

8.   Regarding **claim 19,** Denenberg discloses the method of the first format is an international telephone format, and the second format in a national telephone format (page 2, paragraph 0017).

9.   Regarding **claims 20 and 21,** Deneberg discloses a converting step that matches the mapping rule, a portion of the destination telephone number in the second format based on a pattern within the destination telephone number in the second format, and determines that the prescribed pattern of the regular pattern is specified within the matched mapping rule (page 2, paragraphs 0026 and 0028).

10.   Regarding **claim 22,** Deneberg discloses a medium consisting of the converting step of replacing at least a portion of the destination telephone number in the second format with a replacement value specified in the matched mapping rule (page 2, paragraph 0027 and 0028).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marky M Kidd whose telephone number is 703-305-8149. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:30am-4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang can be reached on 703-872-9314. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-5403 for regular communications and for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-306-0377.

Marky M Kidd
Examiner
Art Unit 2645

***

October 1, 2002

FAN TSANG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600